

REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-9, 11-26, 28-38, 41-43, 47, 48, 51-53, and 57-60 are pending in the present application. Claim 37 has been amended. Claims 22-26, 28-36, 42, 43, 52, 53, 58, and 60 have been withdrawn following a restriction requirement imposed in a prior Office action. Claims 10, 27, 39, 40, 44-46, 49, 50, and 54-56 were previously cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the withdrawn claims is respectfully requested concurrent with an indication of allowance of the currently pending claims. Furthermore, Applicants maintain the right to pursue the subject matter of the withdrawn claims in one or more divisional applications.

Reconsideration of the claims based on the below comments is respectfully requested.

Telephone Interview and Interview Summary

The Applicants note with appreciation the telephone interview with Examiner Bhatnagar on October 20, 2009. During the interview, the April 4, 2008 Office action ("April 2008 action"), September 4, 2008 response ("September 2008 response"), and the June 23, 2009 Office action ("June 2009 action") were discussed. Specifically, the Applicants identified that the June 2009 action provided no substantive response to arguments presented in the September 2008 response, in particular, regarding obviousness rejections based on Par in view of Baird EP 1 041 523 A2 ("Baird"). Furthermore, the Applicants identified that the June 2009 action makes a similar anticipation rejection based on Par that was previously overcome during prosecution of the present application. The Examiner indicated that he would fully address Par, Baird, or any combination thereof in the next Office action.

Patentable Subject Matter Rejection

Claims 37, 38, and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S. C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Independent claim 37 has been amended to positively tie the claimed method to a particular machine (i.e., a processor or another processor) that accomplishes the claimed elements. Claims 38 and 41, by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 37, also include the recited processor features. For at least these reasons, the

patentable subject matter rejection of claims 37, 38, and 41 should be withdrawn and the claims should be in a condition for allowance.

**Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-21, 37, 38, 41, 47,
48, 51, 57, and 59 Based On Paraskevagos**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11-13, 16-21, 37, 38, 41, 47, 48, 51, 57, and 59 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paraskevagos US 7,006,664 (hereinafter “Par”). Claims 3, 5, 14 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Par. These rejection are respectfully traversed.

Contrary to the statements of the present Office action, the Examiner explicitly stated in a prior office action that:

Par. does **not** teach “a processor communicatively coupled to the image scanner, the processor operable to create a data file comprising one or more currency bill images, wherein each currency bill image is tagged with the extracted serial number of that currency bill and the identifier of the transaction involving that currency bill to allow for the involved one or more currency bills to be subsequently traced by serial number to that transaction.”

(April 4, 2008 Final Office Action, at 3) (emphasis added).

Furthermore, as previously discussed in a September 4, 2008 Amendment, Par’s system differs from the claimed invention as described below. Par discloses a system for authenticating currency using a scanner along with optical character recognition software to recognize a currency by denomination or serial number. (*See* column 2, lines 9-18.) Par further discloses digitally storing the serial number of the currency bill and transmitting the numbers from the bills through a communication link to a central processing authority. (*See* column 2, lines 17-18; column 3, lines 16-27.) Par also discloses adding an electronic ID to the optically recognized numbers for a passing bill. (*See* column 2, lines 32-34.) However, **Par fails to disclose or suggest** a processor operable to create a data file comprising one or more currency bill images, wherein each currency bill image is tagged with the extracted serial number of that currency bill and the identifier of the transaction involving that currency bill to allow for the involved one or more currency bills to be subsequently traced by serial number to that transaction.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a currency bill scanning device including, *inter alia*, a “processor operable to create a data file comprising one or more currency bill images, wherein each currency bill image is tagged with the extracted serial number of that currency bill and the identifier of the transaction involving that currency bill”. As discussed above, the applied Par reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest such limitations, and thus, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn and the claim should be in a condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-21, and 59

Claims 2-9, 11-21, and 59, which depend from claim 1, are not and cannot be anticipated by Par, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1. Thus, claims 2-9, 11-21, and 59 should also be in a condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 37, 47, and 57

Claim 37 recites a method for **distributing** currency bills including, *inter alia*, (i) obtaining an identifier for a currency bill distribution or reception transaction, and (ii) linking a currency bill image with the serial number for the distributed currency bill and the transaction identifier. Claims 47 and 57 recite devices for distributing currency bills including, *inter alia*, a mechanism for distributing a number of currency bills. The applied Par reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest such limitations. That is, Par does not teach methods or systems for distributing currency in the context of the recited claim elements. For at least these reasons, claims 37, 47, and 57 should be in a condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims 38, 41, 48, and 51

Claims 38, 41, 48, and 51, which depend from either claims 37 or 47, are not and cannot be anticipated by Par, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 37 and 47. Thus, claims 38, 41, 48, and 51 should also be in a condition for allowance.

Comments on Baird Reference

As discussed in the September 4, 2008 Amendment, Baird fails to overcome the deficiencies of Par. Baird describes a method of storing a transaction record in a memory 40 together with images recorded by a camera 22, the record being identifiable by reference to a random code generated in respect to the transaction by a generator 32. (*See, e.g.*, ¶ [0033]). Baird further describes image of tokens being recorded and retained and overlain by a transaction identifier, and possibly other transaction or user identity details, allowing straightforward visual comparison of the deposited tokens with recorded transaction details. (*See* ¶ [0012]). Baird describes the transaction identifier as consisting of numbers representative of the time and date when a transaction took place. (*See* ¶ [0016]). That is, while Baird may disclose an image overlain by a transaction identifier, Baird **fails** to teach or suggest creating a data file comprising an image tagged with a transaction identifier and **with information extracted from the image**, such as a serial number of a currency bill or a unique identifier.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that claims 1-9, 11-21, 37, 38, 41, 47, 48, 51, 57, and 59 are in condition for allowance and action toward that is respectfully requested. If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 425-8552.

* * * * *

It is believed that no fees are due at this time except for the extension of time fee; however, should any additional fees be required (except for payment of the issue fee), or credit for overpayments be due, the Commissioner is also authorized to deduct the fees from, or credit the overpayments to, Nixon Peabody Deposit Account No. 50-4181, Order No. 247171-000379USP1.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 22, 2009

/Peter J. Prommer, Reg. No. 54743/
Peter J. Prommer, Reg. No. 54743
NIXON PEABODY LLP
300 S. Riverside Plaza, 16th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6613
(312) 425-3900 – main
(312) 425-3909 – facsimile

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS